Application No: 10/697,363 Attorney Docket 1-24778

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6 and 10 have been amended. Claims 5, 9 and 17 have been cancelled. No new matter has been introduced. Support for the amended claims is found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings as originally filed. Sixteen (16) claims are pending and remain for consideration. Favorable reconsideration of the pending claims and further examination of the application is respectfully requested.

IN THE CLAIMS

35 U.S.C. § 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-8, 10-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,815,794, issued to Hendrickson et al.

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite "a leg support that is pivotally mounted with respect to a seat tray so that the leg support pivots automatically at the knee joint of a user as a seat back reclines," which was recited in claims 9 and 17, as originally filed. Hendrickson fails to disclose a leg support, as set forth in the claims, as admitted by the Examiner on page 3 of the Official Letter. In the absence of such disclosure, Hendrickson fails to anticipate claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, claims 1 and 10 should be allowable over Hendrickson as amended.

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 11-16 and 18 depend from claims 1 and 10, and should be allowable over Hendrickson for at least the same reason as claims 1 and 10, as set forth above. In addition, claim 6 recites a seat back that is caused to pivot at a seat tray. Hendrickson fails to disclose a seat back that is caused to pivot at a seat tray, as set forth in claim 6. Claims 7 and 15 recite a locking mechanism for locking a back support member in a fixed position with respect to the base. Claims 8 and 16 recite a seat back that is pivotally mounted to a seat tray at pivot points that approximate anatomical pivot points of a user's body. Hendrickson fails to disclose these features as well. In the absence of such disclosure, these claims should be allowable over Hendrickson in their own right.

MacMillan Sobanski Todd

Application No: 10/697,363 Attorney Docket 1-24778

Favorable reconsideration of the claims in view of Hendrickson is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over Hendrickson in view of U.S. Patent No. 327,775, to Dodge. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 9 and 17 have been cancelled and claims 1 and 10 have been amended to include the limitations of claims 9 and 17 as originally present. That is to say, claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite "a leg support that is pivotally mounted with respect to a seat tray so that the leg support pivots automatically at the knee joint of a user as a seat back reclines," which was recited in claims 9 and 17, as originally filed. Hendrickson fails to disclose a leg support, as set forth in the claims, as admitted by the Examiner on page 3 of the Official Letter. For this, the Examiner relies upon Dodge. However, Dodge fails to teach or suggest a leg support that pivots automatically at the knee joint of a user as a seat back reclines, as set forth in the claims. In this regard, Dodge fails to cure the deficiencies in Hendrickson. Accordingly, claims 1 and 10 should be allowable over Dodge in view of Hendrickson.

Claim 19 is similar to claims 1 and 10 in that it also recites a leg support that is pivotally mounted with respect to the seat tray so that the leg support pivots automatically at the knee joint of a user as the seat back reclines. Claim 19 should be allowable over Dodge in view of Hendrickson for the same reasons as claims 1 and 10, as set forth above.

Favorable reconsideration of claims 1, 10 and 19 in view of the forgoing remarks and arguments is hereby requested.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

07/27/2005 17:08 FAX

MacMillan Sobanski Todd

Ø 008

Application No: 10/697,363 Attorney Docket 1-24778

In view of the amendments and above remarks, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Request for Telephone Interview

As a final matter, if the Examiner has any suggestions concerning different claim phraseology that, in the opinion of the Examiner, more accurately defines the present invention, prior to issuance of another Office Action, Applicants' undersigned attorney requests the courtesy of a telephone interview at the Examiner's earliest convenience to discuss the application. Applicants' undersigned attorney may be contacted at (419) 255-5900.